



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/716,998	11/19/2003	Regis J. Cranon	MSI-1733US	7597
22801	7590	05/13/2008	EXAMINER	
LEE & HAYES PLLC 421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500 SPOKANE, WA 99201			IDOWU, OLUGBENGHA O	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
	2623			
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
05/13/2008	PAPER			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/716,998	CRINON ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on **24 January 2008**.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) **1-26** is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) **1-26** is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 – 14 and 20 - 25 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

2. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 12 and 13 recites a computer readable media containing data structures (program attributes and attribute values) which does not impart functionality to a computer or computing device, and is thus considered nonfunctional descriptive material. Such nonfunctional descriptive material, in the absence of a functional interrelationship with a computer, does not constitute a statutory process, machine, manufacture or composition of matter and is thus non-statutory per se.

Nonfunctional descriptive material that does not constitute a statutory process, machine, manufacture or composition of matter and should be rejected under 35 U.S.C. Sec. 101. Certain types of descriptive material, such as music, literature, art, photographs and mere arrangements or compilations of facts or data, without any functional interrelationship is not a process, machine, manufacture or composition of matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-4, 9-10, 14-17, 20 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bokor, publication number: US 2004.0015998 B1 in view of Addington, publication number: US 2004/0025181.

As per claims 1, 20 and 22, Bokor teaches a processor-readable medium having processor-executable instructions that, when executed by a processor, performs a method comprising:

Receiving, by head-end equipment from a content provider (head-end receiving content, [0025], lines 4 - 5), a digital television (DTV) application and its associated metadata (receiving television application and related information, [0032], lines 9 - 12),

Generating, by the head-end equipment a data grouping having application signaling information, wherein the information is based upon the metadata associated with the DTV application (application being pre-coded with triggers, [0027], program information(metadata) containing options to display commercials, [0038], lines 1 – 4, data grouping being referred to as the combination of the application, commercials and commercial triggers, [0024, 0027], head-end sending data to users, [0025], lines 5 - 6);

Sending, by the head-end equipment, a transmission to a DTV receiving unit, wherein such transmission comprises the data grouping (sending application to STB, [0025], lines 1 – 6, head-end sending data to users, [0025], lines 5 - 6), whereby the application signaling information is used by the DTV receiving unit to discover and launch the DTV application (application being pre-coded with triggers, [0027], program information(metadata) containing options to display commercials, [0038], lines 1 – 4). Bokor does not teach wherein the receiving is facilitated by an asset definition interface;

In an analogous art, Addington teaches wherein the receiving is facilitated by an asset definition interface (asset distribution interface [0045]);

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Bokor's interactive application system by including a receiving interface as described in Addington's asset capturing system, for advantages of more streamlined transmission and reception processes and better asset management.

As per claim 2, Bokor and Addington teach a computer storage media as recited in claim 1, wherein the method further comprises storing the DTV application and its associated metadata (Bokor: storing the application, [0025], lines 9 -11).

As per claim 3, Bokor and Addington teach a computer storage media as recited in claim 1, wherein the method further comprises constructing and formatting a DTV data

service transmission which comprises the DTV application (Bokor: orchestrating delivery of services, [0022], lines 6 - 16).

As per claims 4, Bokor and Addington teach wherein the method further comprises generating a content referencing identifier for the DTV application (Bokor: applications being on a carousel, [0025], lines 6 - 10).

As per claim 9, Bokor teaches a computer storage media having processor-executable instructions that, when executed by a processor, performs a method comprising:

Receiving, by a digital television unit from head-end equipment a transmission which includes application signal information about a digital television (DTV) application (receiving television application and related information, [0032], lines 9 – 12, application being pre-coded with triggers, [0027], receiver being digital [0022], lines 1 – 4), wherein metadata associated with the DTV application facilitates management and generation of the application signal information within the head-end equipment (application being pre-coded with triggers for displaying commercials, [0027], program information(metadata) containing options to display commercials, [0038], lines 1 – 4, Head-end sending triggers, [0027], lines 8 - 11);

presenting a user interface (UI) configured to inform a user about the DTV application, wherein contents of the UI are based upon the received application signal information (loading and displaying the application on a television screen, [0025], lines 7 - 10).

As per claim 10, Bokor teaches a computer storage media as recited in claim 9, wherein the method further comprises receiving user input via the UI (transmission based on user request, [0025], lines 1 - 4).

As per claim 14, Bokor teaches a method for managing digital television (DTV) application signaling, the method comprising:

Receiving, by head-end equipment from a content provider, a DTV application and its associated metadata (receiving television application and related information, [0032], lines 9 – 12, head-end receiving content, [0025], lines 4 - 5), wherein the metadata drives data insertion equipment at the head-end equipment (application being hard coded from head-end with trigger point that depend on the kind of application that is running, [0028 -0030]);
constructing and formatting, by the head-end equipment a DTV data service transmission which comprises the DTV application (orchestrating delivery of services, [0022], lines 6 - 16);

generating, by the head-end equipment, a data grouping having application signaling information, wherein the information is based upon the metadata associated with the DTV application (application being pre-coded with triggers, [0027], program information(metadata) containing options to display commercials, [0038], lines 1 – 4, hardcoding triggers in applications, [0027], lines 4 - 6);

application-signaling, by the head-end equipment a DTV receiving unit via a transmission comprising the data grouping (using triggers to tell STB when to insert commercials, [0027]).

As per claims 15, Bokor teaches a method as recited in claim 14, further comprising provisioning transmission bandwidth to transmit periodically the application signaling information built for the metadata (broadcaster sending triggers or signals, [0027], lines 10 -12).

As per claim 16, Bokor teaches a method as recited in claim 14, wherein the metadata is part of an Extended Asset Definition Interface ([0032]).

As per claims 17, Bokor teaches wherein the method further comprises generating a content referencing identifier for the DTV application (Bokor: applications being on a carousel, [0025], lines 6 - 10).

5. Claims 5, 6, 7, 11, 12, 18, 19, 21, 23, 24 and 25 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bokor, publication number: US 2004.0015998 B1 in view of Addington, publication number: US 2004/0025181 in further view of Eyal, patent number: US 6 484 199 B2.

As per claims 5, 6, 7, 11, 12, 18, 19, 21, 23, 24 and 25, Bokor and Addington teach an interactive television application system that gives the user the ability to control

preferences in terms of viewing commercials and wherein the metadata drives data insertion equipment at the head-end equipment ([0028 -0030]).

Bokor and Addington do not teach wherein the associated metadata comprises a data structure embodied on a processor-readable medium, the structure having fields comprising:

an application identifier field for identifying the DTV application; an originator identifier field for identifying the originator of the DTV application; an application-type field for indicating a type of the DTV application; and a rating field for indicating a rating of the DTV application, wherein the metadata drives data insertion equipment at the head-end equipment.

In an analogous art, Eyal teaches the associated metadata comprises a data structure embodied on a processor-readable medium, the structure having fields comprising: an application identifier field for identifying the DTV application (identification, col. 12, line 46); an originator identifier field for identifying the originator of the DTV application (source, col. 12, lines 47); an application-type field for indicating a type of the DTV application (genre type, col. 12, line 50); and a rating field for indicating a rating of the DTV application (rating col. 12, lines 48), wherein the metadata drives .

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Bokor and Addington's interactive application system by including more information such as the source, rating and application identifier as described in Eyal's media search and playback for the advantages of selecting applications that better fit user preferences.

6. Claims 8, 13 and 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bokor, publication number: US 2004.0015998 B1 in view of Addington, publication number: US 2004/0025181 in view of Eyal, patent number: US 6 484 199 B2 in view of Barrus, publication number: US 20050022122 A1 in further view of MacInnis, publication number: US 2003/0028899 A1.

As per claims 8, 13 and 26, Bokor and Addington teaches an interactive television application system that gives the user the ability to control preferences in terms of viewing commercials and wherein metadata drives data insertion equipment at the head-end equipment ([0028 – 0030]).

Bokor and Addington do not teach wherein the associated metadata comprises a data structure embodied on a processor-readable medium, the structure having fields comprising:

an application identifier field for identifying the DTV application; an originator identifier field for identifying the originator of the DTV application; an application-type field for indicating a type of the DTV application; a profile field for indicating a minimum profile of a system on which the DTV application will execute; a permission field denoting “sandbox” security permission of the DTV application; and a rating field for indicating a rating of the DTV application.

In an analogous art, Eyal teaches the associated metadata comprises a data structure embodied on a processor-readable medium, the structure having fields comprising:

an application identifier field for identifying the DTV application (identification, col. 12, line 46); an originator identifier field for identifying the originator of the DTV application (source, col. 12, lines 47); an application-type field for indicating a type of the DTV application (genre type, col. 12, line 50); and a rating field for indicating a rating of the DTV application (rating col. 12, lines 48).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Bokor and Addington's interactive application system by include more information such as the source, rating and application identifier as described in Eyal's media search and playback for the advantages of selecting applications that better fit user preferences.

The combination of Bokor, Addington and Eyal do not teach a permission field denoting "sandbox" security permission of the DTV application.

Barrus teaches the metadata having fields that specify permissions (meta data having permissions, [0122], lines 14 - 16).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the combination of Bokor, Addington and Eyal by including permissions in the metadata as described by Barrus' system for the advantages of controlling changes and who can make them to systems.

The combination of Bokor, Addington, Eyal and Barrus don't teach a profile filed for indicating a minimum profile of a system on which the DTV application will execute.

In an analogous art, MacInnis teaches indicating a minimum profile of a system on which an application will execute (system requirement, [0033]).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the combination of Bokor, Addington, Eyal and Barrus by including a field for system requirements as described in MacInnis' system for the advantages of sending the application to only systems it will function on.

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to OLUGBENGA O. IDOWU whose telephone number is

(571)270-1450. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday, 7am - 5pm Est.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brian Pendleton can be reached on 571 272 7527. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Olugbenga O Idowu/
Examiner, Art Unit 2623

/Brian T. Pendleton/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2623